DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 797 JC 000 736

AUTHOR	Bers, Trudy H.; McMillan, Virginia K.; Parke, Scott J.
TITLE	Student Satisfaction as a Performance-Based Funding Measure: Lessons from a Statewide Survey.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Community Coll. Board, Springfield.
PUB DATE	1999-06-00
NOTE	43p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; *Educational Assessment; *Participant Satisfaction; State Aid; *Student Attitudes; Telephone Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois Community College Board

ABSTRACT

This report by the Illinois Community College Board provides results of a telephone survey of nearly 10,150 community college students who earned 30 or more credits or an associate degree in a baccalaureate-transfer program. This one-time telephone survey was designed to: (1) compare satisfaction levels of transfer-baccalaureate students with existing state-mandated survey data gathered for many years on occupational student satisfaction; (2) test the viability of conducting centralized telephone surveys statewide; (3) compile benchmark data about the satisfaction of baccalaureate-transfer graduates and students; (4) assess whether satisfaction of occupational graduates could serve as an adequate proxy for all certificate and degree-seeking community college students when seeking Performance-based Incentive System (PBIS) funding. Conducting this survey cost $88,000, far more than most colleges might gain in additional PBIS state measure funding. Results indicated a high degree of similarity in the satisfaction ratings given by occupational and baccalaureate-transfer alumni, suggesting that existing occupational student survey data could be used as a proxy for all completers, absent other statewide data. Tables of results, copies of surveys, and summaries of literature related to performance-based funding, student satisfaction and survey research methodology are included. (Contains 25 references.) (PGS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 797

STUDENT SATISFACTION AS A PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING MEASURE: LESSONS FROM A STATEWIDE SURVEY

Authors

Trudy H. Bers
Sr. Director, Research Curriculum and Planning
Oakton Community College

Virginia K. McMillan
Executive Vice President
Illinois Community College Board

Scott J. Parke
Director for Policy Studies
Illinois Community College Board

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. McMillan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Illinois Community College Board
401 East Capitol Avenue
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1711
(217) 785-0123
www.iccb.state.il.us

June 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IC000736

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Illinois Community College Board

STUDENT SATISFACTION AS A PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING MEASURE: LESSONS FROM A STATEWIDE SURVEY

Abstract

This report provides results of a statewide survey of a sample of nearly 10,150 community college students who earned 30 or more credits or an associate degree in a baccalaureate-transfer program. The project was conducted as part of a statewide initiative to develop a performance-based funding system in which performance measures draw largely from existing data sources. The survey concentrated on student satisfaction, though questions regarding future educational plans and access to technology were included for statewide planning purposes as well. Quantitative and anecdotal information will be presented about (1) actual survey results; (2) the extent to which satisfaction of occupational program graduates can serve as a surrogate or proxy for satisfaction levels among other subgroups of community college students; and (3) the value and challenges of conducting statewide telephone surveys of community college alumni.

Introduction and Purpose

This report provides results of a statewide survey of community college students who earned 30 or more credits or an associate degree in a baccalaureate-transfer program. The project was conducted as part of a statewide initiative to develop a performance-based funding system in which performance measures draw largely from existing data sources.

The state's performance-based funding advisory committee recommended using a measure of student satisfaction as one of seven performance indicators, and further recommended using results of the state's annual survey of occupational program graduates because those data were already collected on a regular basis. The state-mandated survey includes approximately one-fifth of occupational programs each year, with all programs surveyed over a five-year period. The survey instrument contains a number of items related to student satisfaction.

Some college officials in the state were skeptical about the extent to which occupational graduate satisfaction was an adequate or accurate indicator of the satisfaction of graduates from baccalaureate-transfer programs as well. Consequently, the state commissioned a one-time telephone survey of baccalaureate-transfer program graduates and baccalaureate-transfer program completers of 30 or more semester credit hours in order to:

- Compare satisfaction levels of occupational and baccalaureate-transfer graduates;
- Test the viability of conducting centralized telephone surveys statewide;
- Compile benchmark data about the satisfaction of baccalaureate-transfer graduates and students;
- Assess whether satisfaction of occupational graduates could serve as an adequate surrogate or proxy for satisfaction of all certificate and degree-seeking community college students.

Background

Illinois community colleges have a history of innovation, and are recognized nationally for proposing new efforts that advance community colleges. In 1996, an Illinois Community College System Funding Task Force recommended that "funding plans should encourage and reward quality, efficiency, productivity, and innovation through performance-based components." The System supported a funding request to explore the feasibility of a Performance-based Incentive System (PBIS), and the Illinois General Assembly appropriated funds to the Illinois Community College Board to initiate a study of a performance-based incentive system for Illinois community colleges. A grant was made to Oakton Community College to coordinate a performance funding project which began in January, 1997. The purpose of the project was three-fold:

- To conduct research on performance-based incentives for community colleges
- To explore the potential utility and feasibility of establishing a performance-based incentive system for Illinois' community colleges, and
- To recommend strategies and activities to the Illinois Community College Board to build consensus about performance-based incentives and to implement a performance-based incentive system pilot project.

An Advisory Committee was formed with broad-based representation from trustees, administrators, faculty, and students. Brenda N. Albright of Franklin Associates provided research and facilitated activities for the project.

The Advisory Committee recommended that the Illinois community college system endorse a performance-based incentive system approach as a practical, effective way of assuring continuing educational improvement. In May 1998, the Illinois Community College Board adopted that recommendation along with the Committee's proposed goals and measures.

The primary focus of the system is on teaching and learning. The system rewards institutions for high performance and/or significant improvement, establishes state and district goals and priorities, provides consequential information for institutions to use in improving performance, provides accountability information to state policy makers, and builds credibility and support for community colleges. A two-tier performance-based pilot model was adopted that included: (1) measures that reflect statewide goals for community colleges and (2) district-specific measures that reflect autonomy, mission differentiation and community needs. Seven goal areas/measures were adopted:

1. Quality of instruction and support services as measured by student satisfaction;

2. Student educational advancement as measured by certificates or degrees earned, transfer, or continued pursuit of educational goals;

3. Student attainment of workforce/business and industry goals as measured by employment or continued pursuit of educational goals;

4. Student' pursuit of upper division coursework and baccalaureate degrees as measured by the number of students transferring;

5. Service to the population within a district as measured by the percent of citizens enrolled in courses;

6. Academically disadvantaged student success as measured by developmental education course completion rates;

7. Ability to address local community and college needs in the areas of workforce development, technology, and responsiveness to local priorities.

Embedded in one of the guiding principles adopted early in the process by the Advisory Committee was that "a cost effective means of data collection should be used. The cost of data collection should not outweigh the value of the data." Thus, the Committee attempted where ever possible to identify measures for which data existed. One of these measures provided the impetus for the research that produced this report.

A statewide goal of high student satisfaction was adopted to: emphasize the importance of student feedback about satisfaction; provide important information about areas that need attention; and identify exemplary services at colleges. The measure is a three year average of the percentage of students who are somewhat or very satisfied with courses in the student's major program of study, courses outside the student's major program of study, and student support programs and services. The cohort is occupational completers (Certificate and Associate Degree recipients) who responded to questions in these areas on the annual Illinois community college Occupational Graduate Follow-up Study.

The Illinois Community College Board has conducted this annual statewide study of occupational program graduates for many years. Corresponding surveys of other program graduates or completers have not been conducted on a regular statewide basis. Some colleges suggested during the course of the development of the PBIS that the student population measured in the Student Satisfaction Goal be broadened beyond occupational graduates. Although some individual colleges conduct surveys of their baccalaureate/transfer graduates on a regular basis and were able to provide data showing little difference in the satisfaction of different types of program graduates, the Committee undertook a statewide pilot effort to determine if a broader population of students' reported student satisfaction levels is different from that reported for occupational students. The results of this pilot effort will be used to help determine if implementing a new statewide study of student satisfaction encompassing a broader cross section of students would be beneficial for the PBIS.

Literature Review

Literature germane to this project falls into three broad categories: performance-based funding, student satisfaction, and survey research methodology.

Performance-based Funding. Across the nation at least 26 states have adopted performance-based funding as a component of their higher education budgets, and as many as 31 states could have performance budgeting of some variety within the next five years (Burke, 1998).

Except in South Carolina, where the legislature mandated that 100 percent of budgeting should be based on performance, performance-based funding comprises a relatively small percentage of the overall state funding (Burke, 1998). Gaither's (1995) *New Directions for Higher Education* contains a number of relevant case studies, though the landscape and details of performance-based funding change so rapidly that finding accurate compilations of performance-based funding systems is a challenging task. Pfeiffer (1998) described Florida's move to performance-based funding and, particularly, those aspects of the movement focused on workforce development and employment. Burke and Servan edited a 1997 issue of *New Directions for Institutional Research* devoted entirely to their work about performance-based funding.

Albright (1995, 1997, 1998) has also written extensively about performance-based funding. Reporting results of a 1997 survey of state higher education offices (Albright, 1998), she identified seven common processes across performance-based funding systems: (1) determining the vision and overall purpose; (2) selecting goals and determining their relative weight; (3) adopting performance measures for institutional achievement of adopted goals; (4) collecting information about each measure; (5) allocating resources; (6) evaluating and adjusting the processes and goals; and (7) communicating performance results to various audiences. The report closes with 12 recommended principles to guide decisions about performance-based funding. These principles include: connecting performance funding with strategic planning, promoting collaboration, using existing data whenever possible, and using measures that reflect quality and customer focus rather than numeric counts.

Most details about performance-based funding plans exist in state-specific reports written for state-level agencies; e.g., a report on Texas initiatives by Elliot (1994), a plan for performance-based funding by the Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (1997), a report by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges reviewing a 1997-98 budget proposal to fund a portion of the California Community College budget on a performance basis (1997), or a report of the Illinois Community College Board Advisory Committee on a Performance-based Incentive System (1998). Albright (1998) noted that, for most states who participated in the SHEEO survey report, it is too early to assess the impact of performance-based funding on institutional behavior.

Student Satisfaction. Studies of student satisfaction are often embedded in accountability and accreditation reports and in studies of institutional effectiveness (see AACC, 1994, Roueche, et. al., 1997). Mahaffey (1998) identified student satisfaction as one of four categories of effectiveness for the Wisconsin Technical College System. Morris-Baldwin (1998) used student satisfaction as a key indicator of institutional effectiveness at Texas State Technical College. Danielson (1998) used Herzberg's two-factor theory of organizational psychology to examine what was satisfying or dissatisfying to students. She found that satisfaction centered on situations that involved contact with people, whereas dissatisfaction was associated with situations where students perceived unfair treatment or difficulties maneuvering through the bureaucracy. The Noel-Levitz group contracts with colleges and universities to conduct student satisfaction studies, and also publishes summary results. Their 1997 report presents results from the fourth National Student Satisfaction Study, which examined areas of campus life of highest importance to students, areas of greatest and least satisfaction, and gaps between levels of importance and satisfaction. Stewart, reporting on benchmarking for quality improvement, suggested that student satisfaction was an appropriate benchmarking measure for enrollment management.

Nord (1997) detailed a study of consumer satisfaction drawn from surveys of Oregon community college students in 1994 and 1996. The survey sought ratings of satisfaction on these variables: college services or programs, academic environment, admissions and registration, rules and policies, facilities, racial harmony, and the general environment. Nord then determined the extent to which satisfaction with these institutional attributes was associated with students' overall or "global" satisfaction. Results were that ratings for various aspects of the institution were stable, and that satisfaction with the academic environment was the most influential variable affecting global satisfaction.

Survey Methodology. Finally, there are numerous studies of survey research as a methodology, some of which concentrate on telephone surveys (Lavrakis, 1987, Frey, 1989, and Frey and Oishi, 1995). Conklin (1999) provided an overview of community college research using telephone surveys based on ten years of experience at Johnson County Community College. She concluded that such surveys are effective albeit expensive tools, with ultimate success influenced by the accuracy of the list of potential respondents, expertise of interviewers, and design of the instrument.

Use of computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) technology is now growing. The technology has the interviewer sitting at a computer, reading the questionnaire from the screen. As he/she enters responses to a question, the computer program automatically feeds the next question to be asked, which can be determined based on the response to the prior question (Lavrakas, 1987). This technology not only combines the interview and data entry into one operation, but minimizes the need for the interviewer to make judgements about which question to ask next when there are built-in skips or question trees to follow.

Another relatively recent change in telephone survey methodology is adjustments that have been made to address the fact that many homes and offices have answering machines. Messages about surveys that address visible or noncontroversial issues may convince people to call back collect or using a toll-free number (Salant and Dillman, 1994).

Methodology

Baccalaureate/Transfer Study. The statewide survey of baccalaureate/transfer students began with preparation of a request for proposals (RFP) to conduct a survey of a sample of Illinois students from every community college in the state who met specified criteria for inclusion in the sample.[1] The RFP outlined in detail the characteristics of the population to be surveyed, desired methodology, survey instrument, timeframe, and deliverables. Seven research firms who might be interested in conducting the survey were contacted and sent the RFP; three submitted proposals, which ranged in cost from $88,000 to just over $250,000. Based on available funds, a generalized perception that the total project should not exceed $100,000 in cost, and qualifications of firms submitting proposals, a research supplier was selected.

[1] A copy of the RFP is available upon request from Trudy Bers at Oakton Community College.

The survey instrument was adapted from the state's existing survey of occupational program completers so that general comparisons between survey results from occupational completers and from students in baccalaureate-transfer curricula could be made. The instrument also contained a small number of questions related to future educational plans and access to technology that were of interest to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, which was engaged in a comprehensive statewide planning initiative for higher education. A copy of the instrument is in Appendix 1.

The Illinois Community College Board provided each college with two files identifying students in the two survey groups for that institution. Survey groups were:

- **Group A, or Graduates** – last attended the community college in fiscal year 1997, and were last enrolled in a baccalaureate transfer curriculum, and earned an associate degree in a baccalaureate transfer curriculum. Only associate degrees are awarded in baccalaureate/transfer areas. The majority of the fiscal year 1997 graduate respondents were from Associate in Arts programs (60.8 percent). Associate in Science recipients accounted for nearly all of the remaining transfer oriented graduates (38.8 percent). Less than half of a percent of the graduates were in Associate in Engineering Science programs. The Associate in Engineering Science is a relatively new degree program which only a handful of colleges offer in Illinois. The degree percentage distribution of baccalaureate/transfer respondents mirrors the composition of all graduates from these programs.

- **Group B, or Non-Graduates** – last attended the community college in fiscal year 1997, and were last enrolled in a baccalaureate transfer curriculum, and had earned at least 30 college-level semester credits or 45 college-level quarter credits at the institution.

Colleges were asked to supply additional data—student names and telephone numbers—to the files, which were then sent to the research company. It should be noted that the company was given the full census data for each group at each college; that is, all students who met the criteria for inclusion in either Group A or Group B.

The research company was given the target number of completed surveys for each group at each college, set to achieve a 90% level of confidence (plus or minus 5%) for each group at each institution. The range of targeted completion numbers per college for Group A, or graduates, was from 32 to 212. The range of targeted completion numbers per college for Group B, or leavers, was from 7 to 250. The total number of responses targeted statewide was, therefore, the sum of group and institution-specific responses. This came to 5,683 graduates and 7,585 leavers, a grand total of 13,268. The research company was instructed to make telephone calls to students in each group for each college until the targeted number of interviews was completed, or until at least four attempts were made. (The company did make fifth attempts on some of the lists.)

Telephone calls were made during the summer of 1998. A total of 10,146 students completed interviews, 76% of the original target. Each succeeding attempt to contact a respondent yielded a smaller number of completions.

Table 1

Attempts to Reach Respondents and Completed Calls

Number of Attempts	Number Completed	Cumulative Completed
One	4,973	4,973
Two	2,992	7,965
Three	1,245	9,210
Four	630	9,840
Five	306	10,146

The external research firm provided the Illinois Community College Board a complete data file of survey responses and each college was provided its own data and a brief summary of its results.

Occupational Graduate Study. The Occupational Graduate Follow-up Study is conducted on an annual basis. All graduates in selected program areas are surveyed. The Illinois Community College Board creates files from its administrative data base and provides these files to the colleges. The colleges then conduct the surveys of their own graduates following a prescribed statewide format and methodology. Colleges may elect to mail their questionnaires, conduct telephone surveys, or use a combination of mail and phone in order to obtain as high a response rate as possible. Appendix 2 contains a sample of the occupational survey form.

The 1997 occupational survey was used to compare the results of baccalaureate/transfer and occupational satisfaction levels. Occupational graduates from 28 selected programs in fiscal year 1997 were surveyed. Appendix 3 shows the program areas. The occupational surveys yielded a 58.6% response rate. Two-thirds of the graduate respondents came from programs in four primary broad areas: Accounting Technician, Precision Metal Workers, Heating, A/C & Refrigeration Mechanics, and Mechanical Engineering-Related Technologies. Both degree and certificate recipients are included in the analysis of occupational graduates.

Results of Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Participants in the baccalaureate/transfer study were asked a series of questions regarding their reasons for attending the community college, their satisfaction with various components of their experience at the college, and their computer access. Both transfer graduates (88 percent) and non-graduates (79 percent) indicated their primary reason for attending the community college was to take courses to transfer to another institution. Eighty percent of the graduates attended another college or university since leaving the community college while 69 percent of the non-graduates had enrolled elsewhere. When asked if they intended to continue their education within the next five years, 92 percent of the transfer graduates and 89 percent of the non-graduates indicated that was their intention. Nine out of ten associate degree graduates (90 percent) and those who had not yet completed their degrees (87 percent) were either satisfied or very satisfied that the community college prepared them for continuing their education.

Transfer student assessments of course-related components of their programs were positive. Course content, lecture/lab experience, and library/audio visuals were rated as satisfactory/very satisfactory by at least 90 percent of the baccalaureate/transfer graduate respondents. Non-graduates also rated these elements high with satisfaction ratings of 94, 89, and 89, respectively for these components. While equipment/facilities/and materials were rated positively, satisfaction was not quite as high as for the other course-related components (87 and 85 percent for graduates and non-graduates).

The percent of baccalaureate/transfer respondents who were satisfied/very satisfied with various student services is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

**Satisfaction with Student Services
Among Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates and Non-Graduates**

Student Service	Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates	Baccalaureate/Transfer Non-Graduates with 30+ Hours
Financial Aid	83.8 %	84.1 %
Tutoring	83.5 %	81.4 %
Student Activities	81.6 %	79.3 %
Academic Advising	76.4 %	73.1 %
Counseling	77.5 %	73.7 %
Career Planning	68.6 %	68.3 %

Satisfaction levels with the above listed student services, while still relatively high, were all below the levels of satisfaction for course-related components. Usage of these services varied. It should be noted that academic advising was the only service in which at least 70 percent of the students participated.

Among baccalaureate/transfer graduates and non-graduates, only about three-fourths of the students were satisfied/very satisfied with the information they received on transfer and transfer planning services. It should be noted that implementation of the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) was taking place just as these students were either finishing their studies or in the middle of them (non-graduates with 30 or more earned credits). The IAI has two components which are designed to make the transfer process easier. The IAI Transfer General Education core is a package of lower-division general education courses that will transfer from one participating school to another and fulfill the lower-division general education requirements at the transfer institution. The IAI Transfer Majors component recommends freshman and sophomore level courses for students interested in specific majors.

Computer and Internet Access Among Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates and Non-Graduates. Baccalaureate/transfer graduates and non-graduates with 30 or more credit hours were asked about their access to computer and internet technology. All percentages cited are for individuals responding to a given item. Both groups were asked whether they thought their access to computers and the internet at home, work and school was convenient.

Table 3

Convenient Computer Access
Among Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates and Non-Graduates

	Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates			Baccalaureate/Transfer Non-Graduates with 30 + Hours		
Convenient Access	Yes	No	Respondents	Yes	No	Respondents
Home Computer	72.8%	27.2%	3,820	71.6%	28.4%	6,138
Work Computer	50.5%	49.5%	3,486	56.0%	44.0%	5,738
School Computer	90.5%	9.5%	3,173	86.8%	13.2%	4,032

Respondents indicated that school provided the greatest computer access among baccalaureate/transfer graduates and leavers. Note that in this context school could include both community colleges and public or private colleges and universities. Work access to computers was rated low by both groups. Overall, ratings of computer access were very similar across graduates and leavers. Baccalaureate/transfer graduates rated their access slightly higher than leavers in home and school computer access. Baccalaureate/transfer program leavers indicated better access at work.

Internet access ratings were very similar among baccalaureate/transfer graduates and non-graduates. Table 4 shows graduates and non-graduates agreed that access to the internet was less convenient than access to computers particularly at home and work. As was the case with computer access, baccalaureate/transfer graduates and non-graduate respondents indicated that school provided them with the most convenient internet access opportunities. School was even more important as a point of convenient access to the internet than to computers. Convenient internet access at school received over one-third more favorable responses than home internet access which was rated second again. At both home and in the workplace, internet access was much less convenient than computer access. Workplace internet access was again rated the lowest by both groups.

Table 4

Convenient Internet Access
Among Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates and Non-Graduates

	Baccalaureate/transfer Graduates			Baccalaureate/transfer Leavers with 30 + Hours		
Convenient Access	Yes	No	Respondents	Yes	No	Respondents
Home Internet	52.9%	47.1%	3,784	49.8%	50.2%	5,976
Work Internet	34.4%	65.6%	3,407	38.5%	61.5%	5,502
School Internet	88.8%	11.2%	3,166	83.2%	16.8%	4,022

School was the primary convenient access point to both computer and internet technology. Both computer and internet access ratings were very similar among baccalaureate/transfer graduates and non-graduates.

Comparative Results of Baccalaureate/transfer and Occupational Graduates
Levels of Satisfaction

One of the major reasons for conducting the study was to determine if there were major differences in satisfaction levels of graduates from different programs. Specifically, could existing data from occupational graduates be used as a proxy measures of satisfaction for performance funding.

Table 5 contains information about characteristics of fiscal year 1997 graduate survey respondents and the corresponding group of all graduates. Relatively minor differences were evident. Among occupational graduates, proportionately more female graduates responded to the survey. Occupational respondents were slightly older and slightly less diverse than all graduates from the targeted programs. For baccalaureate/transfer graduates, female representation was slightly higher among those who returned surveys. Transfer program graduate respondents were slightly younger and slightly less diverse than all baccalaureate/transfer graduates. Overall, Table 5 shows more similarities than differences between the respondents and the larger group of graduates from which they were drawn.

Table 5

**Selected Characteristics of
Occupational Respondents and Occupational Graduates* and Baccalaureate/Transfer
Respondents and All Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates**

Characteristic	Responding Occupational Graduates	Occupational Graduates	Responding Baccalaureate/ Transfer Graduates	Baccalaureate/ Transfer Graduates
Gender				
Female	50.8%	41.7%	64.6%	61.2%
Male	49.2%	58.3%	35.4%	38.8%
Average Age	35.6 years	33.6 years	26.0 years	26.9 years
Racial/Ethnic Group				
White	86.5%	82.4%	87.1%	82.1%
Minority	13.0%	17.4%	12.8%	17.7%
Unknown	.5%	.2%	.2%	.2%

*Targeted occupational programs

The following satisfaction comparisons focus on fiscal year 1997 graduate respondents from occupational and baccalaureate/transfer programs. Overall, graduate respondents expressed a consistently high degree of satisfaction with their experiences at the community college. Satisfaction questions addressing common areas were identical on surveys for fiscal year 1997 occupational and baccalaureate/transfer graduates. The same four-point Likert scale was used in both survey instruments. Points on the scale ranged from a low of 1 for very dissatisfied to a high of 4 for very satisfied. The scales were converted to five-point scale for analyses (e.g., 4 = satisfied and 5 = very satisfied). Results indicate more similarities than differences among graduates from these two broad program areas. The combined/grand mean for all common satisfaction items on the surveys was 4.23 for occupational graduates and 4.11 for baccalaureate/transfer graduates. Nearly all the means indicate a relatively high degree of satisfaction with course-related components, student services and transfer related activities.

Overall, course related components were consistently rated more highly than student services. While virtually all the respondents rated course related components, the use of student services was less consistent. The number of students indicating that they used selected student services varied substantially.

Course-Related Components. Table 6 contains information about graduate satisfaction with course-related components. Throughout the report, higher scores correspond with higher degrees of satisfaction. Occupational graduates tended to have slightly higher satisfaction ratings of course related components than baccalaureate/transfer completers. Both groups of graduates' ratings were in the satisfied range and variability was generally very similar within each group.

Table 6

Comparison of Course-Related Components Among Graduate Respondents

	Occupational Graduates			Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates			
Satisfaction Item	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Library/Audio Visual	830	4.49	0.81	3,374	4.28	0.95	**
Content of Courses	1,204	4.44	0.77	3,836	4.24	0.69	**
Lecture/Lab Exp Group/Ind	1,185	4.33	0.88	3,827	4.25	0.86	**
Equipment/Facilities/Materials	1,194	4.24	1.01	3,830	4.17	1.00	**

Higher values indicate greater satisfaction levels.
* Significant Chi Square Values .05
**Significant Chi Square Values .01

Library/Audio-Visual Materials/Services. Library/audio visual materials and services are so closely related to the academic coursework that they are being addressed under this portion of the report. The mean satisfaction scores indicate that both groups of graduates rated Library/Audio-Visual Materials and Services highest among all satisfaction related questions. Occupational graduates (M 4.49) ratings were slightly higher than baccalaureate/transfer graduates (M 4.28). Variability was also slightly lower among occupational graduates. Overall 90.9 percent of all fiscal year 1997 graduates surveyed indicated that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with library/audio visual materials and services.

Course Content. Once again, the mean satisfaction rating for occupational graduates (M 4.44) was slightly higher than baccalaureate/transfer graduates (M 4.24) regarding community college Course Content. Among both groups of graduates, the response variability was the lowest of any satisfaction question on the surveys. Overall 96.4 percent of all fiscal year 1997 graduates indicated that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the content of their community college coursework.

Instructional Delivery Methods. Occupational graduates (M 4.33) also rated their satisfaction with lectures, lab experience, and group and individual projects slightly higher than graduates from occupational programs (M 4.25). Instructional delivery methods received satisfaction rating in the very satisfied to somewhat satisfied range from 91.6 percent of all graduates.

Instructional Equipment/Facilities/Materials. Again, mean satisfaction ratings of instructional equipment, facilities and materials were slightly higher for occupational (M 4.24) than baccalaureate/transfer (M 4.17) graduates. Both indicate high levels of satisfaction among graduates. Among all graduates, 87.2 percent were either satisfied or very satisfied with college instructional equipment/facilities/materials.

The combined mean (grand mean) for all four Course Related Components was 4.37 for occupational graduates and 4.23 for baccalaureate/transfer graduates. When taken together these responses suggest very high levels of satisfaction with their course related experiences at the community college among graduates surveyed.

Student Services Components. The number of students indicating that they used selected student services varied substantially. Combined figures for all graduate respondents show that Academic Advisement was most frequently used (75.3 percent) support service while Tutoring was the least frequently used service (22.9 percent). Hence, service usage is noted in the following paragraphs as well as satisfaction ratings.

Financial Aid. Over one-third of occupational (36.7 percent) and baccalaureate/transfer graduates (38.9 percent) reported using college Financial Aid services. Likewise, ratings by occupational (M 4.23) and baccalaureate/transfer (M 4.18) graduates show similar levels of satisfaction with Financial Aid services. Eighty-four percent of all graduate respondents were in the satisfied to very satisfied range in their ratings of their interactions with Financial Aid services.

Tutoring. Less than one-quarter of the graduates used Tutoring services (occupational 21.9 percent and baccalaureate/transfer 23.2 percent). Ratings of Tutoring services were identical for graduates from both broad program areas (M 4.15). Overall 84.0 percent of all graduates who used the service were either satisfied or very satisfied with Tutoring.

Academic Advisement. Academic Advisement service usage was high among graduates. These services were used more extensively by baccalaureate/transfer graduates (80.1 percent) than occupational completers (60.6 percent). Although usage was lower, occupational program graduates (M 4.14) were more satisfied with the Academic Advisement they received than their baccalaureate transfer (M 3.87) counterparts. Among all graduate users of the service, 78.2 percent were either very or somewhat satisfied with Academic Advisement.

Table 7

Comparison of Student Service Components Among Graduate Respondents

Satisfaction Item	Occupational Graduates			Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates			
	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Financial Aid	464	4.23	1.24	1,514	4.18	1.19	**
Tutoring	277	4.15	1.16	904	4.15	1.19	
Academic Advisement	765	4.14	1.11	3,119	3.87	1.28	**
Student Activities	293	4.13	1.08	1,436	3.95	1.18	
Counseling	557	4.00	1.20	2,229	3.89	1.29	
Career Planning & Placement	536	3.89	1.25	1,481	3.59	1.33	**

Higher values indicate greater satisfaction levels.
* Significant Chi Square Values .05
**Significant Chi Square Values .01

Student Activities. Just over one-third of the transfer graduates and nearly one-quarter of the occupational graduates reported participation in Student Activities programming. Occupational graduates (M 4.13) rated Student Activities higher than their transfer oriented counterparts (M 3.95). Among all graduates, 82.5 percent were either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with Student Activities.

Counseling. Counseling service usage was higher among transfer graduates (57.3 percent) than completers of occupational programs (44.1 percent). Occupational graduates (M 4.00) were more satisfied with the Counseling services they received than baccalaureate/transfer completers (M 3.89). Over three-quarters of all graduates were satisfied or very satisfied with their Counseling experiences at the college.

Career Planning & Placement Services. Thirty-eight percent of the transfer and 42.4 percent of the occupational graduates reported using the Career Planning and Placement services. Occupational graduates (M 3.89) were slightly more satisfied than baccalaureate/transfer graduates (M 3.59) with Career Planning and Placement services. Variability among baccalaureate/transfer graduate responses was the highest of any satisfaction item on the survey. Similarly, for occupational graduates variability was second highest among all survey satisfaction items. Overall, nearly three-quarters of the combined baccalaureate transfer and occupational graduates were either very or somewhat satisfied with their interactions with Career Planning and Placement services.

The combined/grand mean for all six Service Components was 4.08 for occupational graduates and 3.91 for baccalaureate/transfer graduates. Satisfaction ratings of services tended to be somewhat lower and variability higher than the satisfaction ratings awarded to course related components among both occupational and baccalaureate transfer graduates. Service ratings by occupational graduates were regularly higher than the ratings by their baccalaureate/transfer counterparts. Proportionate service usage tended to be higher among baccalaureate/transfer students. Satisfaction ratings of services by graduates were still in the satisfied range.

Transfer-Oriented Activities. A couple of the questions on both surveys are directly linked to the transfer function. As one might anticipate, graduates who pursued transfer-oriented degrees demonstrated higher ratings of these components.

Table 8

Comparison of Transfer-Oriented Activities Among Graduate Respondents

	Occupational Graduates			Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates			
Satisfaction Item	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	Number	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Preparation for Further Education	1,121	4.17	1.00	3,804	4.32	0.95	**
College Transfer Planning	310	3.81	1.30	2,469	3.89	1.24	**
Information on Transfer	na	na	na	3,704	3.90	1.28	

na = not asked.. Higher values indicate greater satisfaction levels.
* Significant Chi Square Values .05
**Significant Chi Square Values .01

Preparation for Further Education. Mean satisfaction ratings of Preparation for Further Education were higher for baccalaureate/transfer graduates (M 4.32) than occupational program completers (M 4.17). Ninety percent of the graduates were either somewhat or very satisfied with the Preparation for Further Education they received from the community college.

College Transfer Planning. Two-thirds of the baccalaureate/transfer graduates reported interactions with college staff on College Transfer Planning compared to one-quarter of the occupational graduates. Baccalaureate/transfer graduates (M 3.89) rated College Transfer Planning slightly higher than occupational graduates (M 3.81). Variability was relatively high among both groups of graduates. Seventy-eight percent of all graduate respondents were in the somewhat to very satisfied range in their ratings of College Transfer Planning.

Information on Transfer. Only baccalaureate/transfer graduates were asked about their satisfaction with the information they were provided about transfer. The mean for baccalaureate/transfer graduates was 3.90 with a standard deviation of 1.28 indicating a relatively high degree of variability among respondents. Three-quarters of the baccalaureate/ transfer graduates were either somewhat or very satisfied with the information they received on transfer.

Overall both baccalaureate/transfer and occupational graduate ratings of Transfer Oriented Activities were in the satisfied range. The combined mean for the two common Transfer Activities was 4.09 for occupational graduates and 4.15 for baccalaureate/transfer graduates. Overall, transfer degree completers awarded higher ratings to these components than occupational graduates.

Implementing the Survey - Observations

The scale of this centralized data collection initiative and use of an outside market research company to conduct telephone interviews were unique for the Illinois Community College Board. To gain further insights into the realities of implementing a project of this nature, managers at the company conducting the survey were asked to provide their observations about project implementation. It should be noted here that the company is located in the suburban area of Chicago. Since the survey was conducted during the summer, the company was able to hire college students home for summer vacation to conduct the telephone interviews.

Key observations from company officials included:

- Adult interviewers were unwilling or resistant to work on the project because the length of the instrument — i.e., the length of the script they would have to read—was, in their view, too long.
- Young interviewers were willing to work on the project, but proved to be a relatively erratic workforce in terms of coming to work on a regular basis or "staying put" to complete large numbers of surveys at a time. Supervisors at the company said the interviewers simply required a great deal more close supervision than is normally the case.
- Students to be surveyed proved elusively hard to contact; even with four and sometimes five attempts, including leaving a toll-free number to call to complete the interview, the company was able to obtain completed interviews with only about three-quarters of the targeted number.
- The survey itself was straightforward, though longer than most conducted by the company.
- There is a descending completion rate with additional attempts to contact potential respondents. In their experience, after four to five attempts there is very little if any benefit in continuing attempts to contact a particular individual.

Conclusion

Currently, Performance-based Incentive System funds are awarded based on a three-year average of the percent of occupational graduates indicating that they were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with one inclusive measure of course-related components and student services. The statewide effort to collect follow-up data on baccalaureate/transfer graduates cost $88,000. At current funding levels, it is unlikely that any college conducting the study simply to generate additional PBIS state measure funding would receive more dollars than they spent to collect the data. From a program improvement perspective it may, nonetheless, be worthwhile for colleges to conduct extensive follow-up efforts on baccalaureate/transfer graduates and exiting students.

A major finding of this study for the state was the high degree of similarity in the satisfaction ratings given by occupational and baccalaureate-transfer alumni. In some instances statistical analysis of the results indicated significant differences on specific item responses. On a practical level, in considering the cost of conducting additional surveys to obtain the information on baccalaureate/transfer graduates, for the purposes of the Performance-based Incentive System, it appears that occupational student results can be used as a proxy for all completers, absent other statewide data.

Appendix 1

TRANSFER PROGRAM FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

(1) _____ Student group (A = degree; B = credits, no degree)
(2-10) _____ Obs # of subject (social security number)
(11-15) _____ College code - 5-digits

On behalf of [NAME OF COLLEGE], I am surveying alumni who completed 30 or more credits or earned a degree during the past several years. May I speak to _____?

IF PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE, ASK WHEN HE OR SHE MAY BE REACHED OR IF THERE IS ANOTHER NUMBER WHERE HE OR SHE MAY BE CONTACTED.

WRITE IN OTHER TELEPHONE NUMBER(S)

Area code _____ Number _____
Area code _____ Number _____

Are you currently enrolled in [NAME OF COLLEGE]? (NOTE: PERSON WHO ANSWERS TELEPHONE MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION. IF STUDENT ON LIST IS STILL ENROLLED, THEN SUBSEQUENT CALLS DO NOT NEED TO BE MADE.)

(16) _____ 1. Yes [THANK THE RESPONDENT, AND END THE CALL]
_____ 2. No [CONTINUE SURVEY]

As a former student, you have information and insights that are important to the College as it periodically reviews its courses and programs. We have about a dozen questions about your experience at [NAME OF COLLEGE] that we'd like to ask you. Please be assured that we will protect your privacy. The only reports that will be made from your responses will be statistically summarized along with those of other alumni. Is that OK?

1. What was your main objective in attending [NAME OF COLLEGE]? I will read you a list of objectives; please tell me which one was your main objective. (Select only one.)

(17)
_____ 1. Take course work for transfer to another college
_____ 2. Obtain skills needed for entry into a new or different job
_____ 3. Improve skills needed in the job you had
_____ 4. Explore courses to decide on a career
_____ 5. Personal interest or self-development

2. On a 4-point scale (4 = very satisfied, 1 = very dissatisfied), please rate your satisfaction with the following as they pertain to courses you took at [NAME OF COLLEGE].

		Very Satisfied			Very Dissatisfied
(18)	Content of courses	4	3	2	1
(19)	Lectures, lab experiences, and group and individual projects	4	3	2	1
(20)	Equipment, facilities, and materials	4	3	2	1
(21)	Preparation for further education	4	3	2	1
(22)	Information on transfer	4	3	2	1

3. On the same 4-point scale (4 = very satisfied, 1 = very dissatisfied), please rate your satisfaction with each of the following offices or services. If you did not use the office or service, please tell me that.

		Very Satisfied			Very Dissatisfied	Did Not Use
(23)	Financial aid services	4	3	2	1	0
(24)	Academic advising	4	3	2	1	0
(25)	Career planning	4	3	2	1	0
(26)	College transfer planning	4	3	2	1	0
(27)	Counseling	4	3	2	1	0
(28)	Tutoring	4	3	2	1	0
(29)	Library/audio visual services	4	3	2	1	0
(30)	Student activities	4	3	2	1	0
(31)	Computers for doing academic work while you were at the college	4	3	2	1	0

4. Did you attend another college or university after leaving this college?

(32) _____ 1. Yes, transferred to another college or university since leaving this college.
_____ 2. No, did not transfer.

IF YES..... To what college or university did you first transfer?

_____

(WRITE IN NAME AND LOCATION)

5. Whether or not you've already transferred to another college or university, we are interested in your plans for continuing your formal education in the next 5 years. If you've transferred and are finishing your bachelor's degree, think about plans you might have for graduate or other degrees. If you haven't transferred, think about whether you might transfer or return to {NAME OF COLLEGE] in the next 5 years.

5-A. Do you think you will pursue further formal education in the next 5 years?

(33)
_____ 1. Yes CONTINUE WITH Q5-B
_____ 2. No SKIP TO Q6

5-B What would be your main reason for pursuing further formal education?

(34)
_____ 1. Earn an associate degree or certificate
_____ 2. Earn a bachelor's degree
_____ 3. Earn a master's or other graduate degree.
_____ 4. General career advancement
_____ 5. Personal interest or self-development
_____ 6. Other (FILL IN RESPONSE _____)

5-C Would you be most likely to attend school.

(35)
_____ 1. Full-time
_____ 2. Part-time

5-D In what major or subject area are you interested?

(36)
_____ A. Business / Management
_____ B. Communications
_____ C. Computers / Information Technology
_____ D. Education
_____ E. Health fields
_____ F. Psychology
_____ G. Science
_____ H. Social sciences
_____ I. Other _____
WRITE IN RESPONSE

5-E Is the program you want conveniently available to you?

(37) _____ 1. Yes
_____ 2. No
_____ 3. Not sure / don't know

6. Finally, we are also interested in whether you have what you consider to be convenient access to computers and the Internet. Do you have what you think is convenient access to a computer and the Internet at each of these locations? (CIRCLE RESPONSE)

		YES	NO
	At home		
(38)	Access to a computer	1	2
(39)	Access to the Internet	1	2
	At work		
(40)	Access to a computer	1	2
(41)	Access to the Internet	1	2
	At school, if you are current attending		
(42)	Access to a computer	1	2
(43)	Access to the Internet	1	2

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME

Appendix 2

Illinois Community College Board

STANDARDIZED ITEMS TO BE USED IN THE ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE GRADUATE OCCUPATIONAL FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

Name:_____

Address: _____

Social Security Number: _____ Telephone Number: _____

College records indicate you completed the following program:

Title of Program_____

Term Completed _____

Please correct any errors and fill in any missing information in the address or program information presented above before completing the following questions.

1. What was your main objective in attending our college? (Select Only One)

   1.___ Obtain skills needed for entry into new or different job
   2.___ Improve skills needed in present job
   3.___ Explore courses to decide on a career
   4.___ Take coursework for transfer to another college
   5.___ Personal interest or self-development

2. What is your educational status? (Select Only One)

   1.___ Have not been enrolled in college or university since leaving this college
   2.___ Have been enrolled In another college or university since leaving this college but am not currently enrolled
   3.___ Currently enrolled In field of study related to previous community college program
   4.___ Currently enrolled In field of study unrelated to previous community college program

3. What is your present employment status?

1.___ Employed full-time (30 hours or more per week)
2.___ Employed part-time (less than 30 hours per week)
3.___ Full-time military service
4.___ Unemployed, seeking employment
5.___ Unemployed, not seeking employment (Indicate reason below)

a.___ Full-time Student
b.___ Full-time Homemaker
c.___ Health Disability
d.___ Family Responsibilities
e.___ Other (Please specify)_____

* *

PLEASE COMPLETE QUESTIONS 4 THROUGH 9 ONLY IF YOU ARE EMPLOYED. If you are not employed, please go to question 10.

* *

4. How closely is your present job related to your former community college program?

1.___Related (Go directly to Question 5)
2.___Not related (Please answer Question 4-1 before going to Question 5)

ANSWER ONLY IF YOU RESPONDED ·NOT RELATED- TO QUESTION 4

4-1 If your present job is not related to your college program, please check the one <u>best</u> reason why.

1. ___ Preferred to work In another field
2. ___ Found better paying job in another field
3. ___ Could not find a job in field of preparation
4. ___ Worked previously in field of preparation, but changed
5. ___ Preferred not to move to new locality
6. ___ Temporary job while in transition (either in college between jobs or summer employment)
7. ___ Took job in order to get preferred working hours
8. ___ Did not complete program or pass licensing test In order to be eligible to work in my field of preparation

9. ___ Health problems prevented me from working in field of preparation
10. ___ Other (specify)_____

5. On the average, how many hours do you work each week? (Do not include overtime)

_____Hours per week

6. What is your present hourly salary before deductions? (Include commission but not overtime pay)

$_____ Per Hour

NOTE: If you are employed full-time and do not know your hourly salary, you can use the following guide to convert your salary:

WEEKLY SALARY divided by 40 = Salary Per Hour
MONTHLY SALARY divided by 173 = Salary Per Hour
ANNUAL SALARY divided by 2,080 = Salary Per Hour

7. In general, how satisfied are you with your present job? Check one.

1. ___ Very dissatisfied
2. ___ Somewhat dissatisfied
3. ___ Somewhat satisfied
4. ___ Very satisfied

8. When did you begin working In your present job?

1. ___ Before entering the college program
2. ___ While enrolled In the college program
3. ___ After leaving the college program

9. Where is the location of your primary place of employment?

1. ___ Within the community college district **(College should define)**
2. ___ Outside the community college district, but In Illinois
3. ___ Outside Illinois

10. Please rate your satisfaction with the following items as they pertain to skills courses In your major program of study. Circle the number that most clearly represents your opinion. (l-Very Dissatisfied, 2-Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3-Somewhat Satisfied, 4-Very Satisfied.)

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied
a. Content of courses in your program	1	2	3	4
b. Lectures, lab experiences, and group and individual projects	1	2	3	4
c. Equipment, facilities, and materials	1	2	3	4
d. Job preparation	1	2	3	4
e. Preparation for further education	1	2	3	4
f. Information on current employment opportunities and trends	1	2	3	4

11. Please rate your satisfaction with the following items as they pertain to general education or other courses outside your major program of study. Circle the number that most clearly represents your opinion. **(l-Very Dissatisfied, 2-Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3-Somewhat Satisfied, 4-Very Satisfied.)** If you did not take courses outside your program of study, please skip to Question 12.

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied
a. Content of courses outside of your program	1	2	3	4
b. Lectures, lab experiences, and group and individual projects	1	2	3	4
c. Equipment, facilities, and materials	1	2	3	4
d. Job preparation	1	2	3	4
e. Preparation for further education	1	2	3	4

12. Please rate your satisfaction with each office or service listed below. Circle the number that most closely represents your opinion. **(l-Very Dissatisfied, 2-Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3-Somewhat Satisfied, 4-Very Satisfied.)** If you did not use a particular program or service, circle the O, for ·Did Not Use. ~

	Very Dissatisfied			Very Satisfied	NA
a. Financial aid services	1	2	3	4	0
b. Academic advising	1	2	3	4	0
c. Career planning	1	2	3	4	0
d. College transfer planning	1	2	3	4	0
e. Counseling	1	2	3	4	0
f. Tutoring	1	2	3	4	0
g. Library/audio visual services	1	2	3	4	0
h. Student activities	1	2	3	4	0

13. Please provide the following information if you are employed:

Name of Employer: _____

Your Job Title: _____

Your Job Duties: _____

14. **OPTIONAL**

To assist us in improving our program, feedback from employers is most useful. With your permission, we would like to contact your immediate supervisor to obtain his/her suggestions for ways in which we might improve courses and services at the college.

YES, you may contact my supervisor.

If yes, please sign _____

Name of Supervisor: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

NO, you may not contact my supervisor.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR ASSISTING US.
PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

Appendix 3

Illinois Community College Board

OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM AREAS SURVEYED IN FISCAL YEAR 1998

1203	FUNERAL SERVICES AND MORTUARY SCIENCE
1507	QUALITY CONTROL AND SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES
1508	MECHANICAL ENGINEERING-RELATED TECHNOLOGIES
	Mechanical Engineering/Mechanical Technology
	Computer-aided Design
2005	HOME FURNISHINGS & EQUIPMENT INSTALLERS AND CONSULTANTS
2503	LIBRARY ASSISTANT
4605	PLUMBERS AND PIPEFITTERS
	Plumber and Pipefitter*
4702	HEATING, AIR CONDITIONING, & REFRIGERATION MECHANICS &
	Heating, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration Mechanic and Repairer
4801	DRAFTING
	Architectural Drafting
	Mechanical Drafting
4802	GRAPHIC AND PRINTING EQUIPMENT OPERATORS
	Mechanical Typesetter and Composer
	Lithographer and Platemaker
	Printing Press Operator*
	Desktop Publishing Equipment Operator
4805	PRECISION METAL WORKERS
	Machinist/Machine Technologist
	Machine Shop Assistant
	Sheet Metal Worker
	Tool and Die Maker/Technologist
	Welder/Welding Technologist
	Numerical Control*
5004	DESIGN AND APPLIED ART
	Design and Visual Communications
	Commercial Photography
51100	HEALTH AND MEDICAL LABORATORY TECHNOLOGIES/TECHNOLOGIST
	Medical Laboratory Technician
5118	OPHTHALMIC/OPTOMETRIC SERVICES
	Ophthalmic Medical Technologist
5203	ACCOUNTING
	Accounting*
	Accounting Technician
5208	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES
	Banking and Financial Support Services
	Investments and Securities*

* Excluded from state report due to low number of graduates or low response rates.

Appendix 4

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION AND SELECTED OTHER ITEMS

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4A

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER PROGRAM GRADUATES

Satisfaction Item	Total	Percent of Respondents
Library/audio visual Usage 86.7%		
4)Very Satisfied	1,667	49.4%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,369	40.6%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	282	8.4%
1)Very Dissatisfied	56	1.7%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	518	—
Contents of courses		
4)Very Satisfied	1,902	49.6%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,807	47.1%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	108	2.8%
1)Very Dissatisfied	19	0.5%
Lecture, lab experiences, and group and individual projects		
4)Very Satisfied	1,639	42.8%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,857	48.5%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	306	8.0%
1)Very Dissatisfied	25	0.7%
Equipment, facilities, and materials		
4)Very Satisfied	1,693	44.2%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,631	42.6%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	458	12.0%
1)Very Dissatisfied	48	1.3%
Preparation for further education		
4)Very Satisfied	2,025	53.2%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,405	36.9%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	314	8.3%
1)Very Dissatisfied	60	1.6%
College transfer planning Usage 63.4%		
4)Very Satisfied	969	39.2%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	948	38.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	417	16.9%
1)Very Dissatisfied	135	5.5%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	1,423	—
Information on transfer		
4)Very Satisfied	1,607	43.4%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,206	32.6%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	705	19.0%
1)Very Dissatisfied	186	5.0%

SOURCE OF DATA: Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4A
(Continued)

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER PROGRAM GRADUATES

Satisfaction Item		Total	Percent of Respondents
Financial aid services	Usage 38.9%		
4)Very Satisfied		841	55.5%
3)Somewhat Satisfied		429	28.3%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied		166	11.0%
1)Very Dissatisfied		78	5.2%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply		2,378	-----
Academic advising	Usage 80.1%		
4)Very Satisfied		1,272	40.8%
3)Somewhat Satisfied		1,110	35.6%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied		548	17.6%
1)Very Dissatisfied		189	6.1%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply		773	-----
Career planning	Usage 38.1%		
4)Very Satisfied		443	29.9%
3)Somewhat Satisfied		573	38.7%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied		351	23.7%
1)Very Dissatisfied		114	7.7%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply		2,411	-----
Counseling	Usage 57.3%		
4)Very Satisfied		817	36.7%
3)Somewhat Satisfied		909	40.8%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied		345	15.5%
1)Very Dissatisfied		158	7.1%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply		1,663	-----
Tutoring	Usage 23.2%		
4)Very Satisfied		479	53.0%
3)Somewhat Satisfied		276	30.5%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied		106	11.7%
1)Very Dissatisfied		43	4.8%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply		2,988	-----
Student activities	Usage 36.9%		
4)Very Satisfied		535	37.3%
3)Somewhat Satisfied		636	44.3%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied		187	13.0%
1)Very Dissatisfied		78	5.4%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply		2,456	-----

SOURCE OF DATA: Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4B

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM GRADUATES

Satisfaction Item	Total	Percent of Respondents
Library/audio visual Usage 65.7%		
4)Very Satisfied	503	60.6%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	283	34.1%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	32	3.9%
1)Very Dissatisfied	12	1.4%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	433	-----
Contents of courses		
4)Very Satisfied	656	54.5%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	494	41.0%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	38	3.2%
1)Very Dissatisfied	16	1.3%
Lecture, lab experiences, and group and individual projects		
4)Very Satisfied	589	49.7%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	506	42.7%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	69	5.8%
1)Very Dissatisfied	21	1.8%
Equipment, facilities, and materials		
4)Very Satisfied	588	49.2%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	471	39.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	104	8.7%
1)Very Dissatisfied	31	2.6%
Preparation for further education		
4)Very Satisfied	478	42.6%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	514	45.9%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	97	8.7%
1)Very Dissatisfied	32	2.9%
College transfer planning Usage 24.5%		
4)Very Satisfied	110	35.5%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	131	42.3%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	39	12.6%
1)Very Dissatisfied	30	9.7%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	953	-----
Information on transfer		
4)Very Satisfied	NA	-----
3)Somewhat Satisfied	NA	-----
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	NA	-----
1)Very Dissatisfied	NA	-----

NA = Not Asked

SOURCE OF DATA: Occupational Follow-up Study Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4B
(Continued)

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM GRADUATES

Satisfaction Item	Total	Percent of Respondents
Financial aid services Usage 36.7%		
4)Very Satisfied	281	60.6%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	113	24.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	35	7.5%
1)Very Dissatisfied	35	7.5%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	799	----
Academic advising Usage 60.6%		
4)Very Satisfied	362	47.3%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	292	38.2%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	81	10.6%
1)Very Dissatisfied	30	3.9%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	498	----
Career planning Usage 42.4%		
4)Very Satisfied	208	38.8%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	212	39.6%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	82	15.3%
1)Very Dissatisfied	34	6.3%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	727	----
Counseling Usage 44.1%		
4)Very Satisfied	244	43.8%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	203	36.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	86	15.4%
1)Very Dissatisfied	24	4.3%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	706	----
Tutoring Usage 21.9%		
4)Very Satisfied	137	49.5%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	100	36.1%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	24	8.7%
1)Very Dissatisfied	16	5.8%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	986	----
Student activities Usage 23.2%		
4)Very Satisfied	126	43.0%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	130	44.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	23	7.8%
1)Very Dissatisfied	14	4.8%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	970	----

SOURCE OF DATA: Occupational Follow-up Study Survey

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4C

COMBINED RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
ISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER AND OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM GRADUATE

Satisfaction Item	Total	Percent of Respondents
Library/audio visual Usage 81.6%		
4)Very Satisfied	2,170	51.62%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,652	39.30%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	314	7.47%
1)Very Dissatisfied	68	1.62%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	951	----
Contents of courses		
4)Very Satisfied	2,558	50.75%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	2,301	45.65%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	146	2.90%
1)Very Dissatisfied	35	0.69%
Lecture, lab experiences, and group and individual projects		
4)Very Satisfied	2,228	44.45%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	2,363	47.15%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	375	7.48%
1)Very Dissatisfied	46	0.92%
Equipment, facilities, and materials		
4)Very Satisfied	2,281	45.40%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	2,102	41.84%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	562	11.19%
1)Very Dissatisfied	79	1.57%
Preparation for further education		
4)Very Satisfied	2,503	50.82%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,919	38.96%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	411	8.35%
1)Very Dissatisfied	92	1.87%
College transfer planning Usage 53.9%		
4)Very Satisfied	1,079	38.83%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,079	38.83%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	456	16.41%
1)Very Dissatisfied	165	5.94%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	2,376	----
Information on transfer*		
4)Very Satisfied	1,607	43.39%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,206	32.56%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	705	19.03%
1)Very Dissatisfied	186	5.02%

* Only reflects responses by Baccalaureate/Transfer Graduates.

SOURCES OF DATA: Occupational Follow-up Study Survey and Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4C
(Continued)

COMBINED RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
ISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER AND OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM GRADUATE

Satisfaction Item	Total	Percent of Respondents
Financial aid services Usage 38.4%		
4)Very Satisfied	1,122	56.72%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	542	27.40%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	201	10.16%
1)Very Dissatisfied	113	5.71%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,177	----
Academic advising Usage 75.3%		
4)Very Satisfied	1,634	42.07%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,402	36.10%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	629	16.19%
1)Very Dissatisfied	219	5.64%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	1,271	----
Career planning Usage 39.1%		
4)Very Satisfied	651	32.28%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	785	38.92%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	433	21.47%
1)Very Dissatisfied	148	7.34%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,138	----
Counseling Usage 54.9%		
4)Very Satisfied	1,061	38.08%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,112	39.91%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	431	15.47%
1)Very Dissatisfied	182	6.53%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	2,369	----
Tutoring Usage 22.9%		
4)Very Satisfied	616	52.16%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	376	31.84%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	130	11.01%
1)Very Dissatisfied	59	5.00%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,974	----
Student activities Usage 33.5%		
4)Very Satisfied	661	38.23%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	766	44.30%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	210	12.15%
1)Very Dissatisfied	92	5.32%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,426	----

SOURCES OF DATA: Occupational Follow-up Study Survey and Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4D

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER PROGRAM NON-GRADUATES

Satisfaction Item	Total	Percent of Respondents
Library/audio visual Usage 85.7%		
4)Very Satisfied	2,678	50.0%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	2,105	39.3%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	491	9.2%
1)Very Dissatisfied	85	1.6%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	893	---
Contents of courses		
4)Very Satisfied	2,655	43.0%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	3,165	51.3%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	318	5.2%
1)Very Dissatisfied	34	0.6%
Lecture, lab experiences, and group and individual projects		
4)Very Satisfied	2,293	37.5%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	3,201	52.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	563	9.2%
1)Very Dissatisfied	57	0.9%
Equipment, facilities, and materials		
4)Very Satisfied	2,587	42.2%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	2,636	43.0%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	828	13.5%
1)Very Dissatisfied	86	1.4%
Preparation for further education		
4)Very Satisfied	2,775	46.5%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	2,442	40.9%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	617	10.3%
1)Very Dissatisfied	130	2.2%
College transfer planning Usage 48.7%		
4)Very Satisfied	1,089	35.8%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,129	37.1%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	567	18.6%
1)Very Dissatisfied	260	8.5%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,207	---
Information on transfer		
4)Very Satisfied	2,137	38.4%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,921	34.5%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	1,100	19.8%
1)Very Dissatisfied	404	7.3%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	690	---

SOURCE OF DATA: Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4D
(Continued)

RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER PROGRAM NON-GRADUATES

Satisfaction Item		Percent of Respondents
Financial aid services	Usage 37.1%	
4)Very Satisfied	1,276	55.0%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	675	29.1%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	250	10.8%
1)Very Dissatisfied	120	5.2%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,931	----
Academic advising	Usage 70.3%	
4)Very Satisfied	1,567	35.6%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,650	37.5%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	815	18.5%
1)Very Dissatisfied	364	8.3%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	1,856	----
Career planning	Usage 36.0%	
4)Very Satisfied	637	28.3%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	899	40.0%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	512	22.8%
1)Very Dissatisfied	201	8.9%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	4,003	----
Counseling	Usage 50.9%	
4)Very Satisfied	1,168	36.7%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	1,177	37.0%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	549	17.2%
1)Very Dissatisfied	291	9.1%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	3,067	----
Tutoring	Usage 25.4%	
4)Very Satisfied	805	50.7%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	487	30.7%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	190	12.0%
1)Very Dissatisfied	106	6.7%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	4,664	----
Student activities	Usage 28.9%	
4)Very Satisfied	667	36.9%
3)Somewhat Satisfied	765	42.4%
2)Somewhat Dissatisfied	295	16.3%
1)Very Dissatisfied	79	4.4%
0)Did Not Use/No Reply	4,448	----

SOURCE OF DATA: Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4E

RESPONSES TO OTHER ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER PROGRAM GRADUATES

Question	Total	Percent
Main objective in attending this college?		
1)Take course work for transfer to another college	3,368	88.2%
2)Obtain skills needed for entry into a new or different job	123	3.2%
3)Improve skills needed in the job you already have	61	1.6%
4)Explore courses to decide on a career	55	1.4%
5)Personal interest or self-development	213	5.6%
Did you attend another college/university after leaving this college		
1)Yes	3,067	80.2%
2)No	756	19.8%
Think you will pursue further formal education in next 5 years?		
1)Yes	3,475	92.3%
2)No	288	7.7%
Home computer access convenient?		
1)Yes	2,780	72.8%
2)No	1,040	27.2%
Home internet access convenient?		
1)Yes	2,001	52.9%
2)No	1,783	47.1%
Work computer access convenient?		
1)Yes	1,762	50.5%
2)No	1,724	49.5%
Work internet access convenient?		
1)Yes	1,172	34.4%
2)No	2,235	65.6%
School computer access convenient? (Currently attending)		
1)Yes	2,873	90.5%
2)No	300	9.5%
School internet access convenient? (Currently attending)		
1)Yes	2,811	88.8%
2)No	355	11.2%

SOURCE OF DATA: Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

Illinois Community College Board

Appendix Table 4F

RESPONSES TO OTHER ITEMS
BY FISCAL YEAR 1997 BACCALAUREATE/TRANSFER PROGRAM NON-GRADUATES

Question	Total	Percent
Main objective in attending this college?		
1)Take course work for transfer to another college	4,862	78.6%
2)Obtain skills needed for entry into a new or different job	303	4.9%
3)Improve skills needed in the job you already have	210	3.4%
4)Explore courses to decide on a career	273	4.4%
5)Personal interest or self-development	541	8.7%
Did you attend another college/university after leaving this college		
1)Yes	4,204	68.5%
2)No	1,933	31.5%
Think you will pursue further formal education in next 5 years?		
1)Yes	5,138	88.9%
2)No	643	11.1%
Home computer access convenient?		
1)Yes	4,396	71.6%
2)No	1,742	28.4%
Home internet access convenient?		
1)Yes	2,979	49.8%
2)No	2,997	50.2%
Work computer access convenient?		
1)Yes	3,212	56.0%
2)No	2,526	44.0%
Work internet access convenient?		
1)Yes	2,121	38.5%
2)No	3,381	61.5%
School computer access convenient? (Currently attending)		
1)Yes	3,499	86.8%
2)No	533	13.2%
School internet access convenient? (Currently attending)		
1)Yes	3,346	83.2%
2)No	676	16.8%

SOURCE OF DATA: Baccalaureate/Transfer Survey

REFERENCES

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Performance Based Funding: A Faculty Critique and Action Agenda. Sacramento, CA, 1997. (ED 421 192)

Albright, B. "The Accountability Litmus Test: Long-term Performance Improvement with Contained Costs." In Gerald H. Gaither (ed.). Assessing Performance in the Age of Accountability: Case Studies. *New Directions for Higher Education.* no 91. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Albright, B. "Of Carrots and Sticks and State Budgets." *Trusteeship.* April, 1997.

Albright, B. "The Transition from Business As Usual To Funding For Results: State Efforts to Integrate Performance Measures In The Higher Education Budgetary Process." Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers, 1998. (ED 418 652)

American Association of Community Colleges. *Community Colleges: Core Indicators of Effectiveness.* A Report of the Community College Roundtable. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 1994.

Burke, J.C. Performance budgeting and funding: making results count where it matters. *Assessment Update.* 10(6), November-December, 1998.

Burke, J.C., and Servan, A.M. (ed.). Performance Funding for Public Higher Education: Fad or Trend? *New Directions for Institutional Research.* no. 97. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Conklin, K.A. "Community College Telephone Survey Research: An Overview of Methodology and Utility." Community College Journal of Research and Practice. 23(4), 1999.

Danielson, C. "Is Satisfying College Students the Same as Decreasing Their Dissatisfaction?" Paper presented at AIR Annual Form. Minneapolis, MN, 1998.

Elliot, R.W. "An Attempt to Implement Performance-Based Funding in Texas Higher Education: A Case Study." In Rhonda M. Epper (ed.). *Focus on the budget: Rethinking Current Practice.* Denver, CO: State Higher Education Executive Officers and the Education Commission of the States, 1994.

Frey, J.H. *Survey Research by Telephone.* 2d. ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989.

Frey, J.H., and Oishi, S.M. *How to Conduct Interviews by Telephone and in Person.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.

Gaither, G. (ed.). Assessing Performance in an Age of Accountability: Case Studies. *New Directions for Higher Education.* no. 91. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Hudgins, J.L., and Mahaffey, J. "When Institutional Effectiveness and Performance Funding Co-Exist." *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*. 5(1), 1997.

Illinois Community College Board Advisory Committee on a Performance-Based Incentive System. *Report*. Springfield, IL: May, 1998.

Lavrakas, P.J. *Telephone Survey Methods: Sampling, Selection, and Supervision*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1987.

Mahaffey, D. "Case Study Four: Wisconsin Technical College System Institutional Effectiveness Model Development." Journal of Applied Research in the Community Colleges. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*. 5(1), 1998.

Morris-Baldwin, D. "A Student Environment Model: A Measure of Institutional Effectiveness." Paper presented at AIR Annual Form. Minneapolis, MN, 1998.

Noel-Levitz USA Group. "National Student Satisfaction Report, 1997." Iowa City, IA. (ED421 931)

Nord, S.C. "Student Satisfaction in Oregon Community Colleges." 1997. (ED418 763)

Pfeiffer, Jay J. "From Performance Reporting to Performance-Based Funding: Florida's Experiences in Workforce Development Performance Measurement." In Sanchez, J.R., and Laanan, F.S. (ed.), *Determining the Economic Benefits of Attending Community College*. New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 104. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Roueche, J.E., Johnson, L.F., and Roueche, S.D. (eds.). *Embracing the Tiger: The Effectiveness Debate and the Community College*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, 1997.

Salant, P., and Dillman, D.A. *How to Conduct Your Own Survey*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1994.

Stewart, R.G. "Key Process Benchmarking for Continuous Improvement in Higher Education." (ED410 902)

Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. *Performance Funding for Improvement in Washington Community Colleges, Accountability Implementation Plan*, Olympia, WA: September, 1997.